United Nations A/C.1/60/PV.21

General Assembly
Sixtieth session

Official Records

First Committee
21st meeting
Friday, 28 October 2005, 3 p.m.
New York

Chairman: Mr. Choi Young-jin ..... (Republic of Korea)

The meeting was called to order at 3.15 p.m.

Agenda items 85 to 105 (*continued*)

Action on all draft resolutions under all disarmament and international security agenda items

The Chairman: This afternoon the Committee will take action on draft resolutions listed in informal working paper number 4. That document refers to 17 draft resolutions, but requests have been made for the deferment of action on draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.38/Rev.2 under cluster 1 and on draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.1/Rev.1* under cluster 6. Therefore, no action will be taken on those draft resolutions today and we will thus be taking action on only 15 of the draft resolutions.

The floor is open for those delegations wishing to make general statements or to introduce draft resolutions under cluster 1, "Nuclear weapons".

Mr. Sipangule (Zambia): I would like the record to reflect that Zambia's sponsorship of draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.38 has been withdrawn.

Mr. Cynkin (United States of America): I would like briefly to express our delegation's appreciation to you, Sir, to the members of your staff and to the Secretariat for the flexibility and responsiveness shown in providing advance written copies of oral statements on draft resolutions having financial implications. We think that that will make a profound difference to our ability to carry out the work of the Committee, and we thank you very sincerely, Sir, for your efforts in that regard.

Mr. Kone (Mali) (*spoke in French*): Before the Committee takes a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.37/Rev.1, I should like, on behalf of the sponsors, to make a minor revision to the ninth preambular paragraph. The word "illicit" should be inserted before the phrase "small arms and light weapons".

I trust that the Secretariat will make the necessary change.

Mr. Lezona (Congo) (*spoke in French*): On behalf of the States of the Economic Community of Central African States, Congo expresses the wish that draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.41/Rev.1 can be submitted to the General Assembly for adoption.

Mr. Rowe (Sierra Leone): I just want to follow up on what was said by the representative of Mali about the ninth preambular paragraph of draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.37/Rev.1. In addition to that representative's revision, footnote 4 should be placed after the words "In larger freedom: towards development, security and human rights for all", and should read "A/59/2005".

The Chairman: The floor is now open for explanations of vote or position before action is taken on draft resolution in cluster 1.

Mr. Carriedo (Spain) (*spoke in Spanish*): As today the First Committee will at last take a decision

This record contains the text of speeches delivered in English and of the interpretation of speeches delivered in the other languages. Corrections should be submitted to the original languages only. They should be incorporated in a copy of the record and sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned to the Chief of the Verbatim Reporting Service, room C-154A. Corrections will be issued after the end of the session in a consolidated corrigendum.

05-57665 (F)

on draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.8, entitled "African Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zone Treaty" — the Treaty of Pelindaba — the delegation of Spain would like to reiterate its appeal that the record reflect the fact that Spain's explanation of position on this draft resolution was made at the Committee's 20th meeting, on Wednesday, 26 October 2005. We did so then in the belief that that would be the meeting at which the Committee was to take action on the draft resolution.

In order to save the Committee's time, I shall limit myself to requesting that the Spanish delegation's full explanation of position made last Wednesday be reproduced in the record of that meeting. I have made copies of the statement available to the Secretariat and to all representatives.

Nevertheless, as we emphasized in our statements made following the consensus adoption in 1997, 1999, 2001 and 2003 of other draft resolutions on the matter, I wish to reiterate that we do not join the consensus in connection with paragraph 3 of draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.8, which is to be adopted without a vote today, for we continue to have serious reservations about the content of that paragraph.

Mr. Shamaa (Egypt): I wish to speak in explanation of vote on draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.22.

Egypt has supported the active involvement and engagement of the United Nations in addressing the issue of missiles since the introduction of the subject in the First Committee. That support for United Nations engagement stems from our strong belief that the United Nations is the appropriate forum in which to address this and all other issues related to questions of international peace and security.

Since receiving the first draft of The Hague Code of Conduct from the States members of the Missile Technology Control Regime, in 2000, we have expressed our position that there were serious shortcomings in the draft code that, regrettably, were not addressed in the final document. Those shortcomings relate to the areas of peaceful uses, cooperation and assistance. They relate also to the lack of comprehensive scope of the document, which addresses only the issue of the proliferation of missiles but not that of their development.

At the same time, the document addresses ballistic missiles but not other types of missiles, which have been the most common type in terms of use and proliferation, especially in recent decades. The document also ignores the most serious problem: that of the continued presence and development of nuclear weapons, of which ballistic missiles are but means of delivery.

In our view, The Hague Code of Conduct does not address the issue of missiles in a balanced manner, nor can it do so without structural adjustments to its text. We reaffirm the need for all interested United Nations Member States to be openly involved in all phases of discussion and in the adoption of relevant measures to deal effectively with the issue of missile proliferation in all its aspects.

In the light of the foregoing, we have joined other delegations in submitting amendments to draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.22 that would ensure that the issue of missiles is dealt with in a comprehensive manner within the framework of the universal Organization, and in furtherance of a goal that we believe to be universal, namely disarmament and non-proliferation in all its aspects.

Mr. Cynkin (United States of America): I wanted to intervene to give an explanation of position with reference to draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.8.

The United States would like to support the statement made earlier by the representative of Spain concerning draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.8, on the Treaty of Pelindaba. The United States believes that Spain has a legitimate objection to being singled out in operative paragraph 3 of that draft resolution. Furthermore, the United States believes that Spain has a legitimate concern about the status of its national territory that the Treaty of Pelindaba defines as falling within its area of application. Those issues must be addressed.

Therefore, the United States strongly urges the concerned parties to quickly establish an effective process for resolving their differences with a view to finding a solution to these long-standing problems that takes into account the specific circumstances and the diversity of situations existing within the Treaty's area of application before a Pelindaba draft resolution is again considered by the First Committee. The effects of doing so would be beneficial for the Treaty of Pelindaba and for the African nuclear-weapon-free zone that it seeks to establish.

Mr. Gatan (Philippines): I would like to address document A/C.1/60/L.62**. In addition, on behalf of

the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.22, I would like to request a recorded vote on that document.

The proposed amendments to draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.22 contained in document A/C.1/60/L.62** were presented orally last year. This body decided not to accept them. The same amendments were introduced this year in writing, in the form of a document. That was a noticeable improvement that gave us time to reflect on the amendments. Nonetheless, it is an unusual practice that raises some doubts.

Dialogue is truly needed to breach possible conceptual gaps. The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.22 attempted to hold a dialogue. As Chair of The Hague Code of Conduct, the Philippines conveyed the sponsors' request for the withdrawal of document A/C.1/60/L.62** with the assurance that the Philippines, as Chair, would raise the concerns articulated in that document at the next plenary meeting of the Code's subscribing States. The Hague Code of Conduct Chair was not given any mandate to enter into negotiations on a text already approved by subscribers to the Code in plenary meeting.

Notwithstanding the inability of the proponents of document A/C.1/60/L.62** to agree to our request, the Philippines will bring their proposals to the next plenary meeting of the Code. However, in the context of the present meeting of the First Committee, we are unable to consider their proposals positively. We regret that we will vote against document A/C.1/60/L.62**, and we invite other sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.22 to consider doing the same.

Mr. Labbé (Chile) (*spoke in Spanish*): The delegation of Chile wishes to support the statement just made by the representative of the Philippines in his capacity as Chair of the International Code of Conduct against Ballistic Missile Proliferation.

My country, like the other subscribers to the Code, has always been open to dialogue with States non-parties and has always expressed its readiness to consider all proposals that can improve the Code's effectiveness in an atmosphere of cooperation and mutual respect. We recall that last year, when we held the chairmanship of the Code of Conduct, we did not accept the proposals submitted by two countries because they were introduced orally and only moments before the voting. We appreciate the fact that this time they were formalized in writing, but we regret that their submission was not at least announced before the meeting of the Code's subscriber States, held in Vienna in June. That would have enabled us to study and discuss them as necessary and would have enabled the Philippines to come to the present session with a mandate regarding them.

We also regret that the sponsors of the proposed amendments contained in document A/C.1/60/L.62** were not able, in a spirit of dialogue and compromise, to defer their proposals to the 2006 General Assembly session and thereby give the Code's subscribers the opportunity to discuss and analyse their proposals at the next meeting of the contracting parties in June 2006.

For Chile, it is very important to prevent the Code from being politicized, because we know its objective is to help to increase transparency and confidence on the part of the international community and to combat the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and their systems of delivery.

In view of those considerations, my delegation will vote against the proposed amendments contained in document A/C.1/60/L.62, although we are prepared to discuss and analyse them in Vienna next year. In that connection, we wish to invite all interested States to begin a dialogue that will permit greater awareness of the concerns and interests of all parties and that will make it possible to engage in joint efforts with a view to improving the Code of Conduct.

The Chairman: We have heard the last speaker in explanation of position.

The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.8. I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Ms. Stoute (Secretary of the Committee): The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.8, entitled "African Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zone Treaty". The draft resolution was introduced by the representative of Nigeria on behalf of the States Members of the United Nations that are members of the Group of African States. The sponsors are listed in documents A/C.1/60/L.8 and A/C.1/60/INF/2/Add.1.

The Chairman: I should like to inform members that the sponsors of the draft resolution have expressed the wish that it be adopted by the Committee without a vote. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.8 was adopted.

The Chairman: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.22, entitled "The Hague Code of Conduct against Ballistic Missile Proliferation". Written amendments to the draft resolution are contained in document A/C.1/60/L.62**. A separate recorded vote has been requested on each of the three proposed amendments contained in document A/C.1/60/L.62**. There being no objection, I call on the Secretary of the Committee to conduct the voting.

Ms. Stoute (Secretary of the Committee): Document A/C.1/60/L.62** was introduced by the representative of the Islamic Republic of Iran, also on behalf of Egypt, Indonesia and Malaysia, at the Committee's 21st meeting, on 28 October 2005. The sponsors of the proposed amendments are listed in document A/C.1/60/L.62**. In addition, Kazakhstan and the Marshall Islands have become sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.22.

The Committee will now proceed to take a separate vote on the proposed amendment to the eighth preambular paragraph of draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.22, contained in document A/C.1/60/L.62**, which reads as follows: "Add the words 'development and' before the word 'proliferation' and the words 'in a comprehensive manner' at the end of the paragraph".

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Algeria, Bangladesh, Bhutan, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Egypt, El Salvador, Haiti, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Jamaica, Malawi, Malaysia, Mauritius, Mexico, Pakistan, Qatar, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam

Against:

Albania, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Belgium, Benin, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cameroon, Canada, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Estonia, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kyrgyzstan, Latvia, Lesotho, Liberia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, San Marino, Senegal, Serbia and Montenegro, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Timor-Leste, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Abstaining:

Barbados, Belize, Bolivia, Botswana, Lebanon, Thailand, Yemen

The amendment was rejected by 105 votes to 26, with 7 abstentions.

Ms. Stoute (Secretary of the Committee): The Committee will now vote on the proposed amendment to operative paragraph 1 of draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.22, which reads as follows: "Add the word 'first' before the word 'practical'".

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Algeria, Bangladesh, Bhutan, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, China, Cuba, Egypt, El Salvador, Honduras, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Jamaica, Malaysia, Mexico, Pakistan, Syrian Arab Republic, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam

Against:

Albania, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Belgium, Benin, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cameroon, Canada, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominica, Dominican Republic,

Ecuador, Estonia, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kyrgyzstan, Latvia, Lesotho, Liberia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Palau, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, San Marino, Senegal, Serbia and Montenegro, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Abstaining:

Barbados, Belize, Bolivia, Botswana, Haiti, India, Lebanon, Mauritius, Thailand, Yemen

The amendment was rejected by 108 votes to 19, with 10 abstentions.

Ms. Stoute (Secretary of the Committee): The Committee will now vote on the proposed amendment to operative paragraph 3 of draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.22, which reads as follows: "Replace the words 'Encourages the exploration of' with the words 'Encourages the United Nations to explore'".

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Algeria, Bangladesh, Bhutan, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, China, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Egypt, El Salvador, Haiti, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Jamaica, Malaysia, Mauritius, Mexico, Pakistan, Qatar, Syrian Arab Republic, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam

Against:

Albania, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Belgium, Benin, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cameroon, Canada, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kyrgyzstan, Latvia, Lesotho, Liberia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, San Marino, Senegal, Serbia and Montenegro, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Abstaining:

Barbados, Belize, Bolivia, Botswana, Lebanon, Thailand, Yemen

The amendment was rejected by 106 votes to 24, with 7 abstentions.

The Chairman: The Committee will now proceed to vote on draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.22. A recorded vote has been requested. I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Ms. Stoute (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.22, entitled "The Hague Code of Conduct against Ballistic Missile Proliferation", was introduced by the representative of the Philippines at the Committee's 16th meeting, held on 20 October 2005. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in documents A/C.1/60/L.22, A/C.1/60/INF/2* and A/C.1/60/INF/2/Add.1.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Latvia, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Nauru, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Palau, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Senegal, Serbia and Montenegro, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

Iran (Islamic Republic of)

Abstaining:

Algeria, Cuba, Egypt, India, Indonesia, Lebanon, Malaysia, Mauritius, Mexico, Pakistan, Syrian Arab Republic

Draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.22 was adopted by 151 votes to 1, with 11 abstentions.

The Chairman: The floor is now open for statements in explanation of vote or position on the draft resolutions just adopted.

Mr. Freeman (United Kingdom): I speak on behalf of the European Union (EU) and all the countries that have aligned themselves with it, on draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.8, entitled "African Nuclear Weapon-Free Zone Treaty". The EU attaches great importance to the development and strengthening, wherever possible, of internationally recognized nuclear-weapon-free zones, based on arrangements freely arrived at among the States of the region.

Nuclear-weapon-free zones enhance regional and global peace and security and are a means to promote nuclear disarmament, stability and competence. We welcome and support the signature and ratification by the nuclear-weapon States of the relevant protocols of nuclear-weapon-free zones and look forward to the entry into force of the African Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zone Treaty at an early date. The EU therefore welcomes the efforts undertaken this year in the First Committee to preserve consensus on the draft resolution and is satisfied that that was the case.

Nevertheless, as contemplated in the guidelines adopted by the Disarmament Commission at its 1999 substantive session on the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones on the basis of arrangements freely arrived at among the States of the region concerned, every zone is the outcome of specific circumstances and must reflect the diversity of situations existing within it. Every nuclear-weapon-free zone must be a well defined geographical entity.

The European Union shares Spain's legitimate concern not to be singled out in the draft resolution. The Union calls upon the parties concerned to resume their efforts to find a solution acceptable to all of them that takes into account the specific circumstances and the diversity of situations existing within the area of application of the Treaty.

Mr. El Hadj Ali (Algeria) (*spoke in French*): My delegation would like to make a statement in explanation of vote on draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.22. Combating the proliferation of delivery systems for weapons of mass destruction is undeniably a measure that contributes to attaining the objective of the disarmament and non-proliferation of nuclear, chemical and biological weapons. My country attaches particular importance to this issue and supports initiative to

promote the elimination of those weapons and their delivery systems. Also, we faithfully fulfil all our international obligations in that field.

My delegation was not able to vote in favour of the draft resolution entitled "The Hague Code of Conduct against Ballistic Missile Proliferation", contained in document A/C.1/60/L.22, because the draft resolution in question was not discussed with the other members of the General Assembly in a timely manner. Nor did the draft resolution take into account amendments proposed since the last session, which aimed to introduce the idea of vertical non-proliferation of ballistic missiles and underline the role of the United Nations in that process.

We believe that the comprehensive, balanced and non-discriminatory treatment of the issue of missiles requires going beyond the horizontal proliferation of missiles to include other, no less important vertical elements such as their design, development, testing and deployment.

In conclusion, my delegation believes that the United Nations remains the natural framework for negotiations on those issues and the adoption of instruments of such importance and that the Conference on Disarmament is the sole multilateral disarmament negotiating forum.

Mr. Hu Xiaodi (China) (*spoke in Chinese*): The Chinese delegation voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.22, entitled "The Hague Code of Conduct against Ballistic Missile Proliferation". I would like to take this opportunity to explain China's position on this question.

China agrees with the non-proliferation objective of the Hague Code of Conduct and participated in the discussions on the draft Code. Since some of China's concerns were not resolved during those discussions, China has not subscribed to the Code of Conduct. However, China will continue to exchange views with all sides, including the Hague Code of Conduct participants, in our joint efforts to prevent the proliferation of ballistic missiles.

China has consistently supported non-proliferation and has advocated the elimination of weapons of mass destruction and the strengthening of relevant international non-proliferation efforts through broadbased dialogue and cooperation. We believe that the United Nations should play its full role in that process.

Mr. Gala López (Cuba) (*spoke in Spanish*): As it did on a similar text last year, my delegation abstained in the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.22. Our position is based on the following elements. In 2002, Cuba actively participated in two of the meetings devoted to negotiating the international Code of Conduct against Ballistic Missile Proliferation, when our delegation set out our main substantive and procedural difficulties.

The process of the adoption of the Code should not set a precedent for future negotiations in the field of disarmament and non-proliferation. There was a lack of transparency in the negotiations leading up to the Code's adoption. The process took place outside the framework of the United Nations, and it was noted that the main promoters of the initiative were not willing to allow any substantive changes to the text.

As a result of those conditions, the result of the negotiations was a political instrument that does not adequately reflect the main interests of a significant number of countries. For example, the Code does not address the question of the peaceful use of missile technology or the need for cooperation in that field in response to the specific interests of developing countries. At the same time, the Code's focus is limited to the horizontal aspect of proliferation, disregarding the vertical aspect. Nor does the Code address the need to achieve the goal of disarmament, in particular nuclear disarmament, given that the proliferation of ballistic missile capable of delivering weapons of mass destruction is only one part of the problem.

We therefore consider that The Hague Code of Conduct is an instrument that deals with the question of missile proliferation in a selective manner. That is contrary to the non-discriminatory, balanced and broad manner in which we have been addressing the issue of missiles in all its aspects in the framework of the General Assembly.

The technology of ballistic missiles capable of delivering weapons of mass destruction is shared by a small number of States. Development and economic growth and vital progress in information and telecommunications technology are the common aspiration and goal of all countries, especially

developing countries. Promoting the economic development of countries should be the other side of the coin as we seek to put an end to the proliferation of ballistic missiles capable of delivering weapons of mass destruction.

The transfer of technologies that benefit the peaceful development of countries must not be banned. What should be stopped is their use for military purposes. We reaffirm that economic and social development is not the exclusive right of only a few countries. Rather, it is the common patrimony of humankind.

Mr. Najafi (Islamic Republic of Iran): I have taken the floor to explain the position of my delegation with respect to draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.22, entitled "The Hague Code of Conduct against Ballistic Missile Proliferation".

Like last year, my delegation was forced to vote against the draft resolution on The Hague Code of Conduct due to the fact that its sponsors were not ready to consider or discuss improvements to the text. The text of the draft resolution was drafted and submitted without consideration of the views of countries not subscribing to The Hague Code of Conduct. Those countries had presented amendments with the aim of improving the text, in order to give room to non-subscribing States with reservations on the substance of The Hague Code of Conduct and not to oppose the draft resolution as a whole.

The Hague Code of Conduct was drafted and endorsed outside the United Nations and without the participation of all interested countries. As has been stated, the aim of introducing a draft resolution at the United Nations should be to ensure the involvement of all Member States, including non-subscribing States to The Hague Code of Conduct. Unfortunately, the approach of carrying out discussions on this issue behind closed doors was continued, with States being asked to agree on the text of the draft resolution without any possibility for discussion. They were also being asked to agree on the text on a take-it-or-leave it basis. We hope that this policy will be reconsidered.

We are glad that, for the first time, informal consultations were organized — and albeit too late — by the Philippines, current Chair of The Hague Code of Conduct process. Certainly, expressing readiness to consider the proposed amendments to the draft resolution was a positive gesture. We hope that the same atmosphere will continue next year, and that thorough and positive interaction between States concerned will provide a text more acceptable to the General Assembly.

As has been stated, the Chair of The Hague Code of Conduct has promised substantive and positive consideration of the amendments presented to the General Assembly at the next plenary session of subscribing States to The Hague Code of Conduct. My delegation appreciates that and looks forward to engaging constructively in order to agree on a text more acceptable to the General Assembly.

Mr. Prasad (India): My delegation has requested the floor to explain its vote on the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/60/L.22, entitled "The Hague Code of Conduct against Ballistic Missile Proliferation".

India is fully committed to the non-proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and their means of delivery, including ballistic missiles. The proliferation of ballistic missiles in our region has had an adverse impact on India's security. We would like to underline the responsibility of States in preventing, combating and eliminating the proliferation of ballistic missiles. India believes that multilaterally negotiated and legally binding instruments provide the best mechanisms to deal with disarmament and non-proliferation issues, including the proliferation of ballistic missiles. An inclusive approach enables the international community to deal with issues in a comprehensive manner while securing the support of a large majority of States. India believes that a multilateral and inclusive process will be able to deal with the issue of the proliferation of ballistic missiles in a comprehensive way.

Mr. Percaya (Indonesia): My delegation abstained in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.22. Like many other Members of the United Nations, my delegation recognizes the importance of the issue of ballistic missile proliferation and the need to address it immediately in today's international security environment. Given the complex nature of the problem, from the very beginning of deliberations on this particular issue my delegation affirmed its resolve to find a comprehensive solution to the problem. But such a solution will very much depend upon the ways and means we employ to approach it.

While recognizing that current mechanisms — more specifically, The Hague Code of Conduct — have contributed to international peace and security, my delegation believes The Hague Code of Conduct to be only a first practical step in that direction. Therefore, given the complex nature of the problem, it is our firm conviction that, as an international body responsible for maintaining international peace and security, the United Nations should be given a greater role in the process.

In our view, those elements were lacking in draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.22, which we have just adopted. It is for that reason that Indonesia, along with other members, decided to propose amendments, set out in document A/C.1/60/L.62**, which the First Committee earlier failed to adopt. The proposed changes were intended to strengthen the draft resolution and to emphasize the importance of the United Nations in the process of establishing the International Code of Conduct, as well as to reflect current international realities.

My delegation also has some procedural concerns, such as the non-inclusive negotiating process. We are firmly convinced that the issue of missiles should, and probably will, be addressed within the United Nations system.

Because of its non-legally-binding nature, many members perceive The Hague Code of Conduct as a confidence-building measure, even though it is aimed at creating universal norms in the development, testing and deployment of ballistic missiles, particularly those that are capable of delivering weapons of mass destruction. If the proponents of The Hague Code of Conduct are serious about creating such universal norms, then the engagement and involvement of non-subscribing States are prerequisites to prevent the process from being regarded as non-inclusive and non-transparent.

Mr. Hashmi (Pakistan): I am taking the floor to explain our vote on the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/60/L.22, entitled "The Hague Code of Conduct against Ballistic Missile Proliferation".

Pakistan shares the view that the issue of missiles remains complex. Proposals to address that matter continue to lack consensus. The inability of the last Panel of Governmental Experts to agree on a report only confirmed those realities. Pakistan therefore underlines the need to address the issue in all its aspects in a duly constituted multilateral forum, so that the views and concerns of all countries can be taken onboard.

We acknowledge that some efforts were made to accommodate the concerns of States. Given the ad hoc nature of the forum where The Hague Code of Conduct was negotiated and the lack of proper deliberations, the final product could not gain the support and acceptance of several missile-possessing States. Mine is a country that was obliged to respond to the missile threat introduced in our region, and The Hague Code of Conduct did not address our security concerns.

We note that, while the sponsors did indeed hold informal consultations to present the draft resolution — and we share the view that they were indeed late in doing so — the absence of any attempt to negotiate a generally acceptable text was also apparent this year. We also note that the sponsors continue to seem more interested in getting the draft resolution adopted than in promoting its objectives.

For the reasons I have outlined, my delegation abstained in the voting.

Mr. Atieh (Syrian Arab Republic) (*spoke in Arabic*): My delegation would like to explain its vote on the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/60/L.22, entitled "The Hague Code of Conduct against Ballistic Missile Proliferation".

My country reaffirms its full commitment to the Charter of the United Nations and to multilateralism in the context of effectively implementing disarmament mechanisms aimed at eliminating weapons of mass destruction, foremost among which are nuclear weapons, as well as its commitment to adopting a clear approach to the control of nuclear weapons at all levels, while at the same time reserving the right to self-defence provided for under Article 51 of the Charter.

My delegation abstained in the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.22 because The Hague Code of Conduct is selective and discriminatory. It focuses on one particular kind of weapon — ballistic missiles — and does not touch upon other groups of weapons, allowing them to be monopolized by one particular State. The Code considers the question of proliferation from one particular perspective, and thus fails to address the reasons for such proliferation. More

important, the Code runs counter to the multilateral approach of the United Nations.

The Committee should adopt a draft resolution addressing the issue of missiles in all its aspects in an inclusive manner, in the context of the United Nations, free from selectivity and discrimination. The approach of concluding an instrument outside the context of the United Nations and afterwards imposing it within the United Nations context greatly harms non-proliferation and disarmament mechanisms and encourages a retreat from the objectives of non-proliferation.

The Chairman: We will now move to cluster 2, "Other weapons of mass destruction".

We will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.33/Rev.1. I give the floor to the Secretary of the First Committee.

Ms. Stoute (Secretary of the First Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.33/Rev.1 is entitled "Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production and Stockpiling of Bacteriological (Biological) and Toxin Weapons and on Their Destruction". The draft resolution was introduced by the representative of Hungary at the Committee's 10th meeting, on 12 October 2005. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in document A/C.1/60/L.33/Rev.1.

There is an oral statement regarding the draft resolution, which, with the Chairman's permission, I shall now read out.

> "In connection with draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.33/Rev.1, entitled "Convention on the Prohibition of the development, Production and Stockpiling of Bacteriological (Biological) and Toxin Weapons and on Their Destruction", I wish, on behalf of the Secretary-General, to put on record the following statement of financial implications.
>
> "Under the terms of operative paragraph 6 of draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.33/Rev.1, the General Assembly would request the Secretary-General to continue to render the necessary assistance to the depositary Governments of the Convention, and to provide such services as may be required for the implementation of the decisions and recommendations of the Review Conferences, including all necessary assistance to the annual meetings of the States parties and the meetings of experts and to render the necessary assistance, and to provide such services as may be required for the Sixth Review Conference and the preparations for it.
>
> "The States parties to the Convention, at the 9th plenary meeting of the Fifth Review Conference, on 15 November 2002, approved the cost estimates for servicing the annual meetings of States parties to the Convention of one-week's duration each year, commencing in 2003, until the Sixth Review Conference, and the two-week meetings of experts to prepare each meeting of States parties.
>
> "Similarly, it is expected that the States parties to Convention, at their annual meeting in December 2005, will approve the cost estimates prepared by the Secretariat for servicing the Sixth Review Conference and its Preparatory Committee. The costs of the Sixth Review Conference and its Preparatory Committee would be borne by the States parties and States not parties to the Convention participating in such meetings, in accordance with the United Nations scale of assessments, adjusted appropriately.
>
> "It is recalled that all activities related to international conventions and treaties that, under their respective legal arrangements, are to be financed outside the regular budget of the United Nations may be undertaken by the Secretariat only when sufficient funding is received in advance from States parties. Accordingly, the adoption of draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.33/Rev.1 would not give rise to any programme budget implications."

The Chairman: The sponsors of the draft resolution have expressed the wish that it be adopted by the Committee without a vote. If I hear no objection, I will take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.33/Rev.1 was adopted.

The Chairman: The floor is open for explanations of position on the draft resolution just adopted.

Ms. Paterson (United Kingdom): I have the honour to speak on behalf of the European Union (EU) and all those countries that have aligned themselves with it on draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.33/Rev.1.

entitled "Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production and Stockpiling of Bacteriological (Biological) and Toxin Weapons and on Their Destruction".

The EU very much agrees about the importance of having achieved consensus on the draft resolution. The EU would like to take this opportunity to reiterate its commitment to the review process of the Biological and Toxin Weapons Convention (BTWC), as provided for under article 12 of the Convention, as well as its support for all of the decisions of the Fifth Review Conference of the BTWC States parties, including that the 2006 Review Conference will consider the work of the meetings of States parties and meetings of experts and decide on any further action.

The Chairman: The Committee will now proceed to cluster 3, "Outer space".

The Committee will proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.30/Rev.1. A recorded vote has been requested. I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Ms. Stoute (Secretary of the First Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.30/Rev.1 is entitled "Transparency and confidence-building measures in outer space activities". The draft resolution was introduced by the representative of the Russian Federation at the 20th meeting, on 26 October 2005. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in document A/C.1/60/L.30/Rev.1.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Monaco, Mongolia, Morocco, Myanmar, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia and Montenegro, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

United States of America

Abstaining:

Israel

Draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.30/Rev.1 was adopted by 158 votes to 1, with 1 abstention.

The Chairman: I give the floor to the representative of China, who wishes to speak in explanation of vote on the draft resolution just adopted.

Mr. Hu Xiaodi (China) (*spoke in Chinese*): The Chinese delegation voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.30/Rev.1, entitled "Transparency and confidence-building measures in outer space activities". Outer space is the common heritage of mankind. For years, the international community has made tireless efforts to prevent the weaponization of, and an arms race in, outer space. The draft resolution, sponsored by the Russian delegation can help attract greater attention to the issue of outer space from all sides. We appreciate and support such efforts.

At the same time, we believe that the best way to prevent the weaponization of, and an arms race in, outer space is to negotiate and conclude the relevant legal instruments. Our work to promote transparency and confidence-building measures in outer space should focus on that goal.

The Chairman: We turn next to cluster 4, "Conventional weapons". The floor is open for general statements.

Mr. Landman (Netherlands): I would like to introduce draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.34/Rev.1, which is entitled "Addressing the negative humanitarian and development impact of the illicit manufacture, transfer and circulation of small arms and light weapons and their excessive accumulation".

By introducing this draft resolution, we aim to make the work of the First Committee more relevant. It is a one-time-only draft resolution. It is a draft resolution on a topical subject, namely, connecting the concept of the close interlinkage that exists between development, peace, security and human rights — framed earlier this year by world leaders — with the issue of small arms. The draft resolution is timely and topical. At the same time, it does not pre-empt the upcoming process leading up to the review conference. This has truly been a joint effort. We would like to thank the many delegations that actively contributed to the genesis of the draft resolution.

We had hoped for consensus on this important subject, taking into account the wide cross-regional support for it. We therefore regret that one country has asked for a recorded vote because it could not support our approach to this issue.

Mr. Gaia Lopez (Cuba) (*spoke in Spanish*): I should like to make a general statement on the cluster entitled "Conventional weapons". In that regard, we would like to reiterate that we share the humanitarian concerns associated both with the illicit trafficking in small arms and light weapons in all its aspects and with the indiscriminate and irresponsible use of anti-personnel landmines.

We also believe that the First Committee should seriously consider and adopt real measures to prevent certain countries from continuing to develop and use increasingly sophisticated and lethal conventional weapons that cause so-called collateral damage, which is a phrase used to conceal innocent victims.

Several draft resolutions have been introduced under this cluster to address illicit small arms and light weapons. We reiterate our support for the United Nations Programme of Action to Prevent, Combat and Eradicate the Illicit Trade in Small Arms and Light Weapons in All Its Aspects, which was adopted in 2001, as well as our firm determination to honour the commitments it contains. We also believe that there should be no reinterpretation of the agreements entered into in 2001, nor should there be a distortion of the mandate of the 2006 Review Conference for the Programme of Action.

Ms. Majali (Jordan): My delegation would like to make a general statement on draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.34/Rev.1, which we support for the following reasons. First, my delegation agrees with the presenter and sponsors of the draft resolution that addressing the negative humanitarian and development impacts of the illicit trade, manufacture, transfer and circulation of small arms and light weapons in post-conflict situations is of utmost importance if peace, reconciliation, safety, security, stability and development are to prevail. Those impacts should therefore be addressed.

Secondly, my delegation notes that, as a starting point, the draft resolution reaffirms respect for, and commitment to, international law and the purposes and principles enshrined in the Charter of the United Nations, thereby clearly setting the stage for our work with respect to the areas we are expected to tackle.

Thirdly, as we have stated on a number of occasions during the work of the First Committee at this session — including during the open-ended round of consultations on preparations for the 2006 Review Conference on the United Nations Programme of Action on small arms and light weapons, and on the Review Conference itself, that were recently held by the Department for Disarmament Affairs — my delegation believes that while those gatherings should focus primarily on their stipulated mandate in evaluating the progress made to date and on determining what else needs to be done to fully implement the commitments undertaken in the Programme of Action as the basis for our work, they should nevertheless also provide an opportunity to address other relevant issues and needs in the future that may have added value in that regard, including humanitarian and developmental challenges, which are of great importance.

My delegation is aware of the importance that many countries emerging from conflict attach to addressing the negative humanitarian and development impact of the illicit trade in small arms and light weapons and to the assistance and cooperation they will seek in that regard, which may be provided by the outcome of the 2006 review.

My delegation notes that the draft resolution reaffirms the urgent need for international cooperation and assistance to support and facilitate efforts to prevent, combat and eradicate the illicit trade in small arms and light weapons in all its aspects, as well as the fact that it calls upon States and appropriate international and regional organizations in a position to do so to seriously consider rendering such assistance.

Finally, my delegation is of the view that the new draft resolution introduced by the delegation of the Netherlands responds to a very important matter. We believe that delegation has worked towards consensus and has exerted genuine and constructive efforts to accommodate the concerns of all delegations as much as possible. We hope this exercise will set the tone for our future work for, and in, the 2006 preparatory and review conferences.

Mr. Rivasseau (France) (*spoke in French*): I am taking the floor in connection with draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.40/Rev.1, entitled "Problems arising from the accumulation of conventional ammunition stockpiles in surplus".

The Secretariat has today made available that document, which contains the revised text of that draft resolution, which we would like to see the Committee adopt on Monday. I want, however, to draw the Committee's attention to the fact that, although we seek the broadest consensus, most satisfactory to all, we may still have to make some minor adjustments to the text before Monday, when action is scheduled. I understand that issuing a second revision could move the debate on the draft resolution to Tuesday or Wednesday. I would like, with the indulgence of my colleagues and friends here, to draw the Chairman's attention to the fact that we could distribute by facsimile, either this evening or over the weekend, a very lightly revised version of the text that could, if there are no objections, then be put before the Committee for approval on Monday morning, hopefully by consensus.

The Chairman: The representative of France has suggested that the Committee defer its action on draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.40/Rev.1 until next week.

Mr. Rivasseau (France) (*spoke in French*): Let me clarify. Draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.40/Rev.1 was not scheduled for today. It was scheduled for Monday, so we are not asking that action on it be deferred; we are asking that it be adopted, as scheduled, on Monday.

We would simply point out that the text of L.40/Rev.1 that you are distributing will probably be very lightly amended by France on the floor Monday morning — if no one objects, of course — so that you will not have to issue a Rev.2 version and then defer its adoption until Wednesday. That is all. The goal is to enable us to adopt it on Monday instead of Wednesday. But if even one delegation has even the slightest problem with that, we would, of course, be prepared to wait until Wednesday, as is customary. Let me recall, however, that the rules of procedure also allow for the possibility of amendments made from the floor.

The Chairman: I give the floor to the representative of Azerbaijan, who wishes to speak in explanation of vote before the voting.

Mr. Mammadov (Azerbaijan): The delegation of the Republic of Azerbaijan would like to make a statement in explanation of vote before the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.56.

In past years, the Republic of Azerbaijan abstained in the voting on the draft resolution entitled "Implementation of the Convention on the Prohibition of the Use, Stockpiling, Production and Transfer of Anti-personnel Mines and on Their Destruction". The reason for that position was the impossibility of our country's signing the Ottawa Convention due to the conflict in and occupation of its territories. In addition, landmines are being used on the front line as a measure of deterrence and in order to prevent possible attacks and the resumption of hostilities.

However, the Republic of Azerbaijan supports the humanistic principles and aims of the Convention. In spite of the ongoing occupation of its territories, and taking into consideration the humanistic goals of the draft resolution, the Republic of Azerbaijan has considered the possibility of changing its position and will vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.56.

The Chairman: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.34/Rev.1.

A recorded vote has been requested.

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee to conduct the voting.

Ms. Stoute (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.34/Rev.1 is entitled "Addressing the negative humanitarian and development impact of the illicit manufacture, transfer and circulation of small arms and light weapons and their excessive accumulation".

This draft resolution was introduced by the representative of the Netherlands at the 12th meeting, on 14 October 2005. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in documents A/C.1/60/L.34/Rev.1 and A/C.1/60/INF/2* and Add.1. In addition, the following countries have become sponsors of the draft: Andorra, Argentina, Austria, Bangladesh, Cyprus, Denmark, Hungary, Ireland, Italy, Latvia, Malta, Slovakia, Thailand, and United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia and Montenegro, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

United States of America

Draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.34/Rev.1 was adopted by 160 votes to 1.

The Chairman: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.37/Rev.1.

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Ms. Stoute (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.37/Rev.1 is entitled "Assistance to States for curbing the illicit traffic in small arms and light weapons and collecting them". This draft resolution was introduced by the representative of Mali, on behalf of the States Members of the United Nations which are members of the Economic Community of West African States, at the Committee's 12th meeting on 14 October 2005. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in document A/C.1/60/L.37/1, A/C.1/60/INF/2 and Add.1. In addition, Chile, Colombia, the Comoros and Mauritania have become sponsors of the draft.

There is an oral statement to that draft resolution which, with the Chairman's permission, I shall now read.

In connection with draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.37/Rev.1, entitled "Assistance to States for curbing the illicit traffic in small arms and light weapons and collecting them", I wish to put on record

the following statement of financial implications on behalf of the Secretary-General.

"By operative paragraph 8 of draft resolution L.37/Rev.1, the General Assembly would invite the Secretary-General and those States and organizations in a position to do so to continue to provide assistance to States for curbing the illicit traffic in small arms and light weapons and collecting them. The related activities pursuant to the request would be financed from extra-budgetary resources. Therefore, should the General Assembly adopt draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.37/Rev.1, no additional requirements would arise under the proposed programme budget for the biennium 2006-2007."

The Chairman: The sponsors of the draft resolution have expressed the wish that the draft resolution be adopted by the Committee without a vote.

May I take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly?

Draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.37/Rev.1 was adopted.

The Chairman: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.49/Rev.1.

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Ms. Stoute (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.49/Rev.1 is entitled "Prevention of the illicit transfer and unauthorized access to and use of man-portable air defence systems". The draft resolution was introduced by the representative of Australia at the Committee's 12th meeting, on 14 October 2005. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in documents A/C.1/60/L.49/Rev.1, A/C.1/60/INF/2* and A/C.1/60/INF/2/Add.1. In addition, Andorra, Japan, Nicaragua and the Republic of Korea have become sponsors of the draft resolution.

The Chairman: The sponsors of the draft resolution have expressed the wish that the draft resolution be adopted by the Committee without a vote. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.49/Rev.1 was adopted.

The Chairman: The Committee will now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.56. A recorded vote has been requested. I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Ms. Stoute (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.56 is entitled "Implementation of the Convention on the Prohibition of the Use, Stockpiling, Production and Transfer of Anti-personnel Mines and on Their Destruction".

The draft resolution was introduced by the representative of Austria at the Committee's 11th meeting, on 13 October 2005. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in documents A/C.1/60/L.56, A/C.1/60/INF.2 and A/C.1/60/INF.2/Add.1.

In addition, the following countries have become sponsors of the draft resolution: Afghanistan, Benin, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Djibouti, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Grenada, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Iraq, Malawi, Maldives, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mozambique, Niger, Paraguay, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Seychelles, Somalia, Suriname, Swaziland, Togo, Uganda, Ukraine, Vanuatu, Zambia and Zimbabwe.

There is an oral statement regarding the draft resolution, which, with the Chair's permission, I shall now read out.

> "In connection with draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.56, entitled 'Implementation of the Convention on the Prohibition of the Use, Stockpiling, Production and Transfer of Anti-personnel Mines and on Their Destruction', I wish to put on record the following statement of financial implications on behalf of the Secretary-General.
>
> "By operative paragraph 8 of draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.56, the General Assembly would request the Secretary-General, in accordance with article 11, paragraph 2, of the Convention, to undertake preparations necessary to convene the next meeting of the States parties, pending a decision to be taken at the sixth meeting of the States parties, and on behalf of the States parties and in accordance with article 11, paragraph 4, of the Convention, to invite States not parties to the Convention, as well as the United Nations, other relevant international organizations or institutions, regional organizations, the International Committee of the

Red Cross and relevant non-governmental organizations to attend the seventh meeting of the States parties as observers.

"In accordance with article 14 of the Convention, the costs of the next meeting of the States parties would be borne by the States parties and States not parties to the Convention participating in that meeting, in accordance with the United Nations scale of assessment, adjusted appropriately.

"The Secretariat will prepare the preliminary cost estimates for the next meeting for the approval of the States parties.

"It is recalled that all activities related to international conventions or treaties that, under their respective legal arrangements, are to be financed outside the regular budget of the United Nations, may be undertaken by the Secretariat only when sufficient funding is received in advance from States parties and States not parties to the Convention participating in these activities. Accordingly, adoption of draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.56 would not give rise to any programme budget implications."

The Committee will now vote on draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.56.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Senegal, Serbia and Montenegro, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Togo, Tonga, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

None

Abstaining:

Cuba, Egypt, India, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Israel, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Myanmar, Pakistan, Republic of Korea, Russian Federation, Syrian Arab Republic, United States of America, Viet Nam

Draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.56 was adopted by 147 votes to none, with 15 abstentions.

The Chairman: The floor is open for explanations of vote after the vote.

Mr. Hu Xiaodi (China) (*spoke in Chinese*): The Chinese delegation voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.56, entitled "Implementation of the Convention on the Prohibition of the Use, Stockpiling, Production and Transfer of Anti-personnel Mines and on Their Destruction".

This is the first time that China has voted in favour of such a draft resolution. China understands, and attaches importance to, the international community's humanitarian concerns about anti-personnel mines. The Ottawa Convention constitutes an important international initiative to address those concerns. China endorses the humanitarian purposes and objectives of the Convention. Although not a party to the Convention, China is willing to maintain

contacts and exchanges with the States parties to the Convention.

China has always been deeply concerned about the civilian casualties caused by the inappropriate use of anti-personnel mines and has made unremitting efforts in cooperation with the international community to address humanitarian concerns related to anti-personnel mines. In recent years, China has been engaged in various international demining cooperation and assistance efforts. In the future, we will continue to provide assistance to mine-affected countries to the extent of our ability.

Mr. Gala López (Cuba) (*spoke in Spanish*): My delegation wishes to explain its vote on draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.56, which has just been adopted. As at previous sessions, the delegation of Cuba abstained in the vote on the draft resolution on implementation of the Ottawa Convention on anti-personnel mines.

I wish to make clear that my country, which is a State party to the Convention on Certain Conventional Weapons, has always attached due importance and attention to the legitimate humanitarian concerns related to the indiscriminate and irresponsible use of anti-personnel mines.

However, for more than four decades, Cuba has been subjected to a policy of continuous hostility and aggression by the military super-Power. Consequently, Cuba cannot renounce the use of that type of weapon in order to preserve is sovereignty and territorial integrity, in accordance with the right of self-defence enshrined in the United Nations Charter.

We shall continue fully to support all efforts that, while maintaining the necessary balance between humanitarian and national security concerns, aim to eliminate the terrible effects on civilians in many countries caused by the indiscriminate and irresponsible use of anti-personnel landmines.

Mr. Prasad (India): My delegation has requested the floor to explain its vote on the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/60/L.56, regarding the implementation of the Mine Ban Convention.

India supports the vision of a world free of the threat of landmines and unexploded ordnance, where individuals and communities live safely and in an environment conducive to development, and where mine survivors are fully integrated into their societies. India's participation at the Nairobi Review Conference of the States Parties to the Convention was reflective of India's commitment to that vision. It is to realize that vision that India has ratified the amended Protocol II to the Convention on Certain Conventional Weapons and has adopted and implemented all measures necessary to adhere to the provisions contained therein.

In 1997, India discontinued the production of non-detectable anti-personnel mines and has observed a moratorium on their transfer. Furthermore, India remains fully committed to increased international cooperation and assistance for a mine-safe world, as well as to providing mine-related assistance under the United Nations umbrella. India is willing to contribute technical assistance and expertise for mine clearance and rehabilitation programmes in international demining efforts. India strongly supports technical cooperation in mine-clearance technology, equipment and training. India has set up a number of camps for the fitting of artificial limbs to landmine victims in Afghanistan.

India believes that a phased approach that addresses the legitimate defence requirements of States, especially those with long borders, would perhaps be more useful. We also believe that the goal of the complete elimination of anti-personnel mines will be facilitated by the availability of appropriate, militarily effective and non-lethal alternative technologies that can perform cost-effectively the legitimate defensive role of anti-personnel landmines.

Mr. Cynkin (United States of America): I am taking the floor to explain my delegation's vote on draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.34/Rev.1. The United States wishes to express its full support for the 2001 Programme of Action to Prevent, Combat and Eradicate the Illicit Trade in Small Arms and Light Weapons in All Its Aspects, as well as for the Review Conference to be held in New York in 2006.

However, despite its support for the Programme of Action, the United States opposed this draft resolution because it links efforts to curb and prevent the illicit trade in small arms and light weapons with the humanitarian and socio-economic consequences of the spread of illicit small arms and light weapons. Although the United States recognizes those issues, we do not believe that they should be raised in the First Committee, which is a forum solely for disarmament and international security issues.

Furthermore, the United States is concerned that the draft resolution pre-empts planning for the upcoming Review Conference on the Programme of Action. We believe that discussion of issues related to the Review Conference, including its agenda, should be left to the discretion of the Preparatory Committee in January. The delegation of the United States looks forward to working with all delegations on the shaping of the agenda for the upcoming Review Conference, so that it focuses on a review of States' efforts to implement the Programme of Action.

Mr. Tan Kok Yam (Singapore): I am taking the floor to explain my delegation's vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.56, entitled "Implementation of the Convention on the Prohibition of the Use, Stockpiling, Production and Transfer of Anti-personnel Mines and on Their Destruction".

Singapore's position on anti-personnel landmines has been clear and open. Singapore supports, and will continue to support, all initiatives against the indiscriminate use of anti-personnel landmines, especially when they are directed at innocent and defenceless civilians. With that in mind, in May 1996, Singapore declared a two-year moratorium on the export of anti-personnel landmines without self-neutralizing mechanisms. In February 1998, Singapore expanded that moratorium to include all manner of anti-personnel landmines, not just those without self-neutralizing mechanisms. We also extended the moratorium indefinitely. At the same time, like several other countries, Singapore firmly believes that the legitimate security concerns and the right to self-defence of any State cannot be disregarded. A blanket ban on all types of anti-personnel landmines might therefore be counter-productive.

Singapore supports international efforts to resolve the humanitarian concerns over anti-personnel landmines. We will continue to work with members of the international community to find a durable and truly global solution.

Mr. Awad (Egypt) (*spoke in Arabic*): The delegation of Egypt would like to explain its votes on draft resolutions A/C.1/60/L.34/Rev.1 and A/C.1/60/L.56.

My delegation voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.34/Rev.1, entitled "Addressing the negative humanitarian and development impact of the illicit manufacture, transfer and circulation of small arms and light weapons and their excessive accumulation", because it believes in the good intentions of the sponsors, who are attempting to discuss the illicit trafficking in small arms and light weapons in the context of its humanitarian and development dimensions. We also supported the draft resolution because of our belief in the need to address the development and humanitarian aspects of the illicit trafficking in small arms and light weapons in States emerging from conflict in a manner that conforms with the ongoing effort at the United Nations to develop the concept of peacebuilding in States emerging from conflict by establishing and operationalizing the Peacebuilding Commission.

As we all know, the majority of States emerging from conflict are located on the African continent. That has prompted us in Africa to pay special attention to strengthening the capacities of such States to address the illicit trafficking in small arms and light weapons in all its aspects, as well as its impact on peace, security and stability. In that connection, the draft resolution's sole operative paragraph sets out a general framework to provide technical and material support to States emerging from conflict through a number of measures and guidelines.

We hope that the implementation of that framework in post-conflict countries will, with the assistance of the United Nations and the international community, contribute to curbing the negative humanitarian and development effects of the illicit trafficking in small arms and light weapons. That hope is bolstered by the fact that the draft resolution reaffirms the need to respect and comply with international law and the principles and purposes of the Charter of the United Nations, including the principles underlying the United Nations Programme of Action: respect for State sovereignty; the right of all peoples to self-determination and to use any legitimate means at their disposal to realize that right; and the right of States to legitimate self-defence.

Those considerations helped us decide to vote in favour of the draft resolution after having participated in its elaboration, despite our reservations about some of its provisions, including the fact that it addresses issues, aspects, and formulations that lie outside the purview, work, and mandate of the First Committee, which is inconsistent with the Committee's original technical mandate to deal with the United Nations disarmament agenda.

Secondly, some have attempted to interpret the outcome document (resolution 60/1) of the September 2005 summit in a simplified manner, linking phrases, ideas and concepts to the mandates of various United Nations organs and Committees in a manner that weakens their capacity to implement their Charter mandates, despite the outcome document's emphasis on the links among development, security and human rights. That requires a non-selective approach. We emphasize the need for a clearly defined distinction between licit and illicit activities, which is an area governed exclusively by national legislation and rules. That applies to the relevant aspects of circulation, manufacturing and stockpiling, covered by the draft resolution just adopted.

Finally, our delegation emphasizes the need for joint action to ensure a successful 2006 Review Conference on the Programme of Action on the illicit trade in small arms and light weapons. That requires a balanced approach to the Programme of Action to avoid creating an imbalance that could adversely affect our joint action and thereby undermine one of the most important and serious aspects of the disarmament agenda.

Our delegation would also like to explain its abstention in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.56, "Implementation of the Convention on the Prohibition of the Use, Stockpiling, Production and Transfer of Anti-personnel Mines and on Their Destruction". We abstained because we believe that the Convention contains significant imbalances — an issue that we have raised repeatedly in the Assembly over the years. The Convention does not address the right of States to legitimate self-defence; nor does it balance the rights and obligations of States parties to the Convention. Moreover, it fails to address the issue of international cooperation with States that have suffered from the proliferation of mines on their territories or the need to provide such States with assistance in mine-clearance.

Mr. Bouchaara (Morocco) (*spoke in French*): My delegation wishes to explain its vote on draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.56, entitled "Implementation of the Convention on the Prohibition of the Use, Stockpiling, Production and Transfer of Anti-personnel Mines and on Their Destruction".

Morocco is not a signatory to the Convention on the Prohibition of the Use, Stockpiling, Production and Transfer of Anti-personnel Mines and on Their Destruction, for imperative security reasons linked to the defence of its territorial integrity and to its legitimate national security interests.

This year, as at the previous session of the General Assembly, Morocco decided to vote in favour of the draft resolution on this subject. By confirming its positive vote, the Kingdom of Morocco wishes to reaffirm its support for and commitment to the humanitarian objectives and principles of the Ottawa Convention. In addition, our positive vote comes on the eve of the Sixth Meeting of States Parties, to be held in Zagreb from 28 November to 2 December 2005.

Here, Morocco would also like to reaffirm its commitment to supporting this review process. I wish to recall once again that Morocco has always implemented de facto many of the Ottawa Convention's provisions. Thus, the Kingdom of Morocco has never produced or exported anti-personnel mines. Moreover, well before the Convention's entry into force, Morocco no longer imported anti-personnel mines.

Finally, the Moroccan delegation wishes to recall that in 2002 the Kingdom ratified Amended Protocol II to the Convention on Conventional Weapons, relative to mines, booby-traps and other devices, considered by the international community to be an essential instrument in the field of humanitarian law. Our signature of Amended Protocol II is additional proof of my country's resolve to continue to contribute to the fight against the scourge of anti-personnel mines.

Mr. Lee Jang-keun (Republic of Korea): My delegation would like to explain its abstention in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.56, "Implementation of the Convention on the Prohibition of the Use, Stockpiling, Production and Transfer of Anti-personnel Mines and on Their Destruction".

As repeatedly stated and emphasized on previous occasions, the Republic of Korea fully shares and supports the spirit and the objectives of the Ottawa Convention. We have no doubt that that important Convention plays, and will continue to play, a central role in alleviating all human suffering caused by the irresponsible, indiscriminate of anti-personnel mines.

However, the unique security situation in our part of the world still does not allow us to adhere to the

Convention. That is the only reason that we abstain in the voting every year on the draft resolution on this theme. Yet we have joined the other instruments of anti-personnel-mine regulation, namely, the Convention on Conventional Weapons and its Amended Protocol II, under which we are actively participating in a range of discussions to ensure that mines are used responsibly, on the basis of a prudent balance between military necessities and humanitarian concerns.

Finally, my delegation would like to explain our national policy and practice with regard to anti-personnel mines. The Republic of Korea does not currently produce or export anti-personnel mines, and we are actively supporting international efforts aimed at mine clearance and victim assistance. The current Government is a regular contributor to the Voluntary Trust Fund for Assistance in Mine Clearance and is also assisting demining operations in Iraq through our contribution to the United Nations Development Group Iraq Trust Fund.

Mr. Shaimerdenov (Kazakhstan): I have requested the floor to explain my delegation's vote on draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.56, entitled "Implementation of the Convention on the Prohibition of the Use, Stockpiling, Production and Transfer of Anti-personnel Mines and on Their Destruction".

Kazakhstan fully supports the objectives and the humanitarian nature of the Ottawa Convention and remains committed to the principle of a non-discriminatory, universal and global ban on anti-personnel landmines. Thus, Kazakhstan does not produce anti-personnel landmines and strictly observes the rules governing their stockpiling. Furthermore, the Government of Kazakhstan has banned the export and transit of landmines.

However, like many other countries, Kazakhstan believes that the issue of anti-personnel landmines involves not only humanitarian aspects but also the legitimate security requirements of Member States. Kazakhstan is prepared to become a party to the Ottawa Convention when the proper conditions are created. Since Kazakhstan is not a signatory to the Convention, my delegation has abstained in the voting on the draft resolution.

Ms. Khyne (Myanmar): I should like to explain the position of my delegation on the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/60/L.56, "Implementation of the Convention on the Prohibition of the Use, Stockpiling, Production and Transfer of Anti-personnel Mines and on Their Destruction".

Myanmar is, in principle, in favour of banning the export, transfer and indiscriminate use of anti-personnel mines. Although Myanmar is not a State party to the Ottawa Convention, my delegation respects the position of the States that are parties to the Convention.

However, Myanmar believes that all States have the right to self-defence, in accordance with Article 51 of the United Nations Charter. Myanmar firmly believes that all States must possess the right of self-defence, as no State would compromise its national security and sovereign interests under any circumstances.

At the same time, we oppose the indiscriminate use of anti-personnel mines, which cause death and injury to innocent people all over the world. These tragedies occur due to the easy availability of landmines.

Based on the reality of the situation, a total ban would not lead to a practical or effective solution. Given these circumstances, we reiterate our belief that the Conference on Disarmament is the most appropriate forum to deal with the problem of illicit trafficking in, and the indiscriminate use of, anti-personnel mines.

My delegation therefore abstained in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.56.

Ms. Leong (Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela) (*spoke in Spanish*): Our delegation wishes to speak in explanation of vote with respect to the four draft resolutions we have just adopted.

The Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela supports and implements the measures set out in the United Nations Programme of Action to Prevent, Combat and Eradicate the Illicit Trade in Small Arms and Light Weapons in All Its Aspects. For that reason, our delegation voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.34/Rev.1, entitled "Addressing the negative humanitarian and development impact of the illicit manufacture, transfer and circulation of small arms and light weapons and their excessive accumulation".

However, we wish to state that we are not satisfied with the draft resolution as worded, despite

the efforts made by the delegation of the Kingdom of the Netherlands, in particular because of the references to "excessive accumulation" contained in the title as well as in the second and eighth preambular paragraphs and operative paragraph 1. Indeed, the draft resolution does not make clear what would be considered an "excessive accumulation". How would that be determined, and who would make such a determination?

The Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela believes that the reference to the excessive accumulation of small arms and light weapons does not prejudge or affect the legitimate sovereign right of every State to obtain, produce and stockpile such weapons in an amount that it considers appropriate to meet its self-defence and security needs.

We also support the efforts of the international community to help countries requiring such assistance to put an end to the illicit trade in such weapons.

For these reasons, my delegation has not opposed the consensus on draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.37/Rev.1, entitled "Assistance to States for curbing the illicit traffic in small arms and light weapons and collecting them".

However, we wish to place on record a reservation with regard to the eleventh preambular paragraph of the draft resolution, which refers to the final document of the 2005 world summit. We would reiterate that, at the time of the adoption of the resolution on that final document, the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Venezuela, Mr. Ali Rodriguez Araque, placed on record a reservation with respect to our country's position on the contents of the document as a whole because of the manner in which it was negotiated and was being adopted. Subsequently, the President of the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela, Mr. Hugo Chávez Frías, denounced the document as null and void and illegal, given that it was approved in violation of the norms of the United Nations and was therefore not valid for our country.

Consequently, our delegation considers that the so-called 2005 world summit outcome document is valid only as a working paper and that reference to it does not give rise to any obligation or mandate for the Republic, since we consider it null and void.

The Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela acceded to the Convention on the Prohibition of the Use, Stockpiling, Production and Transfer of Anti-personnel Mines and on Their Destruction in December 1997. The Convention entered into force for our country on 1 October 1999, and we are in compliance with its provisions. Furthermore, Venezuela has for many years contributed to the mine-clearance process in Central America and fully supports efforts to achieve the goal of a world free of anti-personnel landmines.

For those reasons, our delegation voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.56, entitled "Implementation of the Convention on the Prohibition of the Use, Stockpiling, Production and Transfer of Anti-personnel Mines and on Their Destruction".

However, we wish to place on record a reservation with respect to the eighth preambular paragraph of the draft resolution, which refers to the 2005 world summit outcome document, for the reasons we have just mentioned.

The Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela recognizes the threat posed by the illicit traffic in Man-Portable Air Defence Systems (MANPADS) and the threat to civil aviation and to the maintenance of international peace and security. It supports measures to prevent terrorists from acquiring or obtaining access to such systems. For those reasons, my delegation did not oppose the consensus on draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.49/Rev.1, entitled "Prevention of the illicit transfer and unauthorized access to and use of man-portable air defence systems". However, we wish to emphasize the legitimate sovereign right of States to acquire and possess such weapons to meet their legitimate self-defence and security needs, as recognized in the third preambular paragraph of the draft resolution.

Mr. Hashmi (Pakistan): I am taking the floor to explain our vote on two draft resolutions — A/C.1/60/L.34/Rev.1 and A/C.1/60/L.56.

First, with respect to L.34/Rev.1, entitled "Addressing the negative humanitarian and development impact of the illicit manufacture, transfer and circulation of small arms and light weapons and their excessive accumulation", Pakistan reaffirms and shares the humanitarian and socio-economic concerns that may arise from the illicit trade in small arms and light weapons. We also recognize the various challenges posed, especially to States emerging from conflict.

We appreciate the efforts made by the Netherlands delegation to incorporate suggestions and amendments. However, my delegation — and, indeed, many other delegations — pointed out during the informal consultations that, while the negative impact of the illicit manufacture and transfer of such weapons was understandable, Member States had yet to agree on a common understanding of what constituted the illicit transfer and manufacture of these small arms and light weapons.

Indeed, the proceedings leading to the consensus adoption of the United Nations Programme of Action in 2001 clearly reflected disagreement among Member States on these and other issues. We would therefore have preferred the draft resolution to have kept its focus on the negative impact arising from the agreed understanding of illicit trade rather than introducing elements which have yet to be agreed.

We look forward to the Preparatory Committee of the Review Conference in January and are prepared to discuss and develop a consensus on these and, indeed, on other issues in the context of the question of small arms and light weapons in all its aspects.

The issue of the illicit transfer and manufacture indeed requires further efforts to develop a consensus. We hope that our support for this draft resolution today is not construed as our agreement on these issues, which must be agreed by consensus among all Member States.

I should now like to explain my delegation's vote on draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.56.

Pakistan's position on the question of anti-personnel landmines is well known. Given our security requirements and the need to guard our long borders, which are not protected by any natural obstacle, the use of landmines forms an important part of our self-defence strategy. As such, it is not possible for Pakistan to agree to the demands for the complete prohibition of anti-personnel landmines until viable alternatives are available. My delegation was therefore constrained to abstain in the voting on the draft resolution.

We are against the irresponsible use of landmines. It is indeed their irresponsible use that has caused so much destruction and misery. We remain committed to ensuring the highest standards of responsibility in the use of these defensive weapons.

Pakistan is a party to the Amended Protocol II of the Convention on Certain Conventional Weapons, which regulates the use of landmines in both internal and external conflicts to prevent civilians from falling victim to landmines. We are continuing to implement the Protocol with the greatest earnestness.

Mr. Vasiliev (Russian Federation) (*spoke in Russian*): Russia abstained in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.56. We agree with the humanitarian objectives of the Ottawa Convention and, in principle, we do not reject the idea of acceding to it within a reasonable time frame. However, we can realistically do so only when we are certain that we can meet our obligations. To that end, we need to resolve some military, economic, technological and financial problems.

Mr. Kone (Mali) (*spoke in French*): My delegation welcomes the Committee's adoption without a vote of draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.37/Rev.1, which shows that the question of small arms and light weapons remains an important aspect of general and complete disarmament.

Far from being a subject of interest only to West Africa or Africa alone, the issue of small arms and light weapons continues to occupy a central place in the concerns of the international community. Therefore my delegation would like to take this opportunity to thank, on behalf of the member States of the Economic Community of West African States, all those countries that were kind enough to support the draft resolution. We would like also to thank all those delegations that joined in the consensus on the draft. Finally, I should like to thank the members of the Secretariat for their ongoing availability and assistance.

Mr. Skrabalo (Croatia): Mr. Chairman, as my delegation is taking the floor for the first time during this session of the First Committee, allow me to congratulate you and the Bureau on your election.

I should like simply to place on record the fact that Croatia has co-sponsored the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/60/L.34/Rev.1, entitled "Addressing the negative humanitarian and development impact of the illicit manufacture, transfer and circulation of small arms and light weapons and their excessive accumulation".

Mr. Gala López (Cuba) (*spoke in Spanish*): I should like to make a brief clarification with respect to

draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.37/Rev.1. My delegation's understanding is that it has been adopted and that the corrections made by the delegations of Sierra Leone and Mali will be incorporated in it. Is that also your understanding, Mr. Chairman?

The Chairman: My understanding is that the resolution has been adopted as orally revised.

The Committee will now move on to cluster 5, "Regional disarmament and security".

The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.43/Rev.1.

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Ms. Stoute (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.43/Rev.1 is entitled "Regional confidence-building measures: activities of the United Nations Standing Advisory Committee on Security Questions in Central Africa".

The draft resolution was introduced by the representative of the Congo at the Committee's 21st meeting, on 28 October 2005. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in document A/C.1/60/L.43/Rev.1.

The Chairman: The sponsors of the draft resolution have expressed the wish that the Committee adopt the draft without a vote. If I hear no objection, may I take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly?

Draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.43/Rev.2 was adopted

The Chairman: If no delegation wishes to speak in explanation of vote, the Committee will move on to cluster 6, "Other disarmament measures and international security".

Mr. Cynkin (United States of America): The Secretariat issued draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.1/Rev.1 on "Compliance with non-proliferation, arms limitation and disarmament agreements". But late yesterday, we discovered that this text differed in a number of important respects from the one that we had intended to have published. We have therefore faxed to all delegations a copy of the authoritative text for their consideration. We also have copies here, should any delegation wish to have one. Meanwhile, we drew those technical errors to the attention of the Secretariat, and A/C.1/60/L.1/Rev.1* was issued on 27 October. We understand that it required a particular effort to issue those corrections in so short a time, and my delegation appreciates the prompt assistance of Secretariat officials in rectifying matters.

However, there is still an omission in document A/C.1/60/L.1/Rev.1*. In the interests of efficiency I would like to read out the revision, rather than seeking yet another technical revision. The word "peace" should be added in the third preambular paragraph, so that the paragraph would end, "for regional and global peace, security and stability". Again, we have faxed to all delegations a copy of the authoritative text for consideration, and we have copies here that reflect that change.

Furthermore, we believe that delegations may need time to review the changes reflected in A/C.1/60/L.1/Rev.1* and to study the authoritative text. We have therefore asked for action on the draft resolution to be postponed until our next meeting, and we thank you, Mr. Chairman, for having accommodated us on that matter.

Mr. Rivasseau (France) (*spoke in French*): I would like to introduce a number of stylistic revisions to draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.39/Rev.1, entitled "Preventing the risk of radiological terrorism".

Consultations have continued over the past few days with a view to achieving consensus on the draft resolution. Some stylistic changes were suggested to us. Essentially, if not exclusively, we are citing word for word texts agreed by consensus. We communicated those changes to the sponsors by fax yesterday, and no problems were raised. We therefore propose to incorporate them today into the draft resolution.

Owing to the time required for the translation process, I understand that it will not be possible to issue a second revision until Monday, which means that we would not be able to take action until Tuesday. Since we are reluctant to keep delegations here for an additional day, we propose, if delegations agree, to take action on the text contained in document A/C.1/60/L.39/Rev.1 after it has been orally revised. The revisions were communicated to delegations at the beginning of the meeting.

In the tenth preambular paragraph and operative paragraph 1, the words "in accordance with their national legal principles and consistent with international law" should be replaced with "in accordance with their national legal authorities and

legislation and consistent with international law", which is the language used in operative paragraph 10 of Security Council resolution 1540 (2004).

We want to ensure that the language used in operative paragraph 4 conforms with that contained the resolution of the General Conference of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA), and would therefore replace "calls on" with "urges" before the words "all States to work towards following the guidance contained in the International Atomic Energy Agency code of conduct on the safety and security of radioactive sources".

In conclusion, the following minor errors pointed out by the IAEA will also be corrected. In the sixth preambular paragraph, the words "national and legal regulatory infrastructure" should be replaced by "national, legal and regulatory infrastructure". In the eighth preambular paragraph, the capitalization of the revised action plan referred to should be as follows: "Action Plan for the Safety and Security of Radioactive Sources".

Those are the revisions to the text that we propose, and it is the wish of the sponsors that the draft resolution be adopted without a vote.

The Chairman: The suggestion is that we defer action on A/C.1/60/L.39/Rev.2 until next week. Is that correct?

Mr. Rivasseau (France) (*spoke in French*): We are in the hands of the Committee. It seems to us that the changes to the text are purely stylistic. The language corresponds exactly to that used in the texts that we were asked to base ourselves on. We therefore believe that we are proceeding in accordance with the expressed wishes of all the delegations that were consulted. We therefore hope that the draft resolution can be adopted today. However, if any delegation has objections, we would, of course, be prepared to wait until Monday.

The Chairman: Action on draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.39/Rev.1, as orally revised, will therefore be taken today.

I will now call on those representatives who wish to speak in explanation of vote or position before action is taken on the draft resolutions.

Mr. Prasad (India): My delegation has requested the floor to explain its vote on the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/60/L.39/Rev.1, entitled "Preventing the risk of radiological terrorism", as orally revised by the representative of France.

India is conscious of the threat posed by terrorists, especially the danger that terrorists may acquire and use weapons of mass destruction and radiological materials and sources. We therefore fully share the objective of preventing the risk of radiological terrorism and support international efforts to deny terrorists any opportunity to acquire and use radiological materials and sources.

India has been at the forefront of international efforts to combat the dangers posed by terrorists acquiring and using weapons of mass destruction. Since 2002, our delegation has submitted draft resolutions to the Committee on measures to prevent terrorists from acquiring weapons of mass destruction. We believe that the draft resolution before the Committee on preventing the risk of radiological terrorism complements our draft resolution. We commend France and the other sponsors of the draft resolution for their initiative, to which we lend our support.

Mr. Freeman (United Kingdom): I am taking the floor solely on behalf of the United Kingdom. The United Kingdom is pleased to be able to support draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.16, entitled "Relationship between disarmament and development". We welcome the mainstreaming of disarmament issues in development policy. This is particularly important in the field of conventional weapons, small arms and light weapons and disarmament, demobilization and reintegration. The United Kingdom does not believe that there is an automatic link between disarmament and development. Rather, a complex relationship exists between the two. Unfortunately, the draft resolution does not explain fully the complexity of the relationship.

As we said last year, we also have some reservations about the report of the Group of Governmental Experts. For example, we believe that the report did not give sufficient credit to unilateral, bilateral and multilateral actions in disarmament and non-proliferation.

However, despite those reservations, the United Kingdom's broader commitment to development goals, and our particular concern to combat the scourge of small arms and the impact they have on the lives of

people throughout the world, mean that we can continue to support the draft resolution this year.

Mr. Shaimerdenov (Kazakhstan) (*spoke in Russian*): I would like explain our vote on the draft resolution entitled "Preventing the risk of radiological terrorism", which is contained in document A/C.1/60/L.39/Rev.1. Kazakhstan actively supports Security Council resolution 1540 (2004) and signed the International Convention for the Suppression of Acts of Nuclear Terrorism.

The Government of Kazakhstan is stepping up its measures to strengthen national systems aimed at the monitoring, control, transport and physical protection of nuclear materials. An example of our policy is our joint project with the United States on the safe transportation of fresh highly enriched fuel of the BN-350 reactor and its reprocessing into low-grade nuclear material. Detailed information about the project was provided in the statement made by Mr. Nursultan Nazarbaev, President of Kazakhstan, at the international symposium "Kazakhstan: Strengthening international cooperation for peace and security", held on 8 October 2005 in Ust-Kamenogorsk. The text of the statement is contained in document A/C.1/60/4. We believe that that project, together with Kazakhstan's national practices in the processing of highly enriched uranium into low-grade nuclear material, could serve as a model for the development of such projects in other countries. We intend to actively share our experience and have expressed our willingness to cooperate with other States with a view to the establishment of similar programmes.

On the basis of those considerations, my delegation will vote in favour of the draft resolution on preventing the risk of radiological terrorism. We thank the sponsors for elaborating a draft resolution that addresses such an important and timely issue in the field of international security.

The Chairman: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.16. A recorded vote has been requested. I call on the Secretary of the Committee to conduct the voting.

Ms. Stoute (Secretary of the Committee): The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.16, entitled "Relationship between disarmament and development". The draft resolution was introduced by the representative of Indonesia, on behalf of the States Members of the United Nations that are members of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, at the Committee's 14th meeting, on 18 October 2005. The sponsors are listed in the document.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Finland, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia and Montenegro, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Togo, Tonga, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania,

Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

United States of America

Abstaining:

France, Israel

Draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.16 was adopted by 154 votes to 1, with 2 abstentions.

The Chairman: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.29*. A recorded vote has been requested. I call on the Secretary of the Committee to conduct the voting.

Ms. Stoute (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.29* is entitled "Developments in the field of information and telecommunications in the context of international security". The draft resolution was introduced by the representative of the Russian Federation at the Committee's 13th meeting, on 17 October 2005. The sponsors are listed in documents A/C.1/60/L.29* and A/C.1/60/INF/2*.

There is an oral statement regarding the draft resolution, which, with the Chairman's permission, I shall now read out.

> "In connection with draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.29*, entitled 'Developments in the field of information and telecommunications in the context of international security', I wish to put on record the following statement of financial implications on behalf of the Secretary-General.
>
> "By operative paragraph 4 of draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.29*, the General Assembly would request the Secretary-General, with the assistance of a group of governmental experts to be established in 2009 on the basis of equitable geographical distribution, to continue to study existing and potential threats in the sphere of information security and possible cooperative measures to address them, as well as the concepts referred to in paragraph 2 above, and to submit a report on the results of this study to the General Assembly at its sixty-fifth session. It is envisaged that the group of governmental experts would hold one organizational session in Geneva in 2009 and three substantive sessions in New York in 2010. Therefore, there would be conference-servicing requirements for the four sessions of the group of experts. In addition, non-conference-servicing requirements would be needed to allow the Department for Disarmament Affairs to provide the necessary substantive services to the sessions of the group of governmental experts in 2009 and 2010.
>
> "Accordingly, should the General Assembly adopt draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.29*, the additional requirements would arise under the proposed programme budget for the biennium 2006-2007. The requirements pertaining to the meetings of the group of governmental experts in 2009 and 2010 would be considered in the context of the proposed programme budgets for the bienniа 2008-2009 and 2010-2011, respectively."

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Monaco, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of

Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia and Montenegro, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

United States of America

Draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.29 was adopted by 165 votes to 1.*

The Chairman: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.35. I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Ms. Stoute (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.35 is entitled "National legislation on transfer of arms, military equipment and dual-use goods and technology". The draft resolution was introduced by the representative of the Netherlands at the Committee's 12th meeting, on 14 October 2005. The sponsors are listed in the document.

The Chairman: The sponsors of the draft resolution have expressed the wish that it be adopted by the Committee without a vote. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.35 was adopted.

The Chairman: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.39/Rev.1, as orally revised. A recorded vote has been requested. I call on the Secretary of the Committee to conduct the voting.

Ms. Stoute (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.39/Rev.1 is entitled "Preventing the risk of radiological terrorism". The draft resolution was introduced by the representative of France at the Committee's 14th meeting, on 18 October 2005. The sponsors are listed in documents A/C.1/60/L.39/Rev.1 and A/C.1/60/INF/2* and Add.1. In addition, Canada, Chile, Congo, Guinea, Ireland, Israel, Senegal, Serbia and Montenegro and Sweden have become sponsors.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia and Montenegro, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

None

Draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.39/Rev.1, as orally revised, was adopted by 162 votes to none.

The Chairman: I shall now call on representatives wishing to speak in explanation of vote or position on the draft resolutions just adopted.

Mr. Cyzkin (United States of America): I would like to speak in explanation of vote on draft resolutions A/C.1/60/L.16 and A/C.1/60/L.29*.

First, with respect to draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.16, the United States has again voted against a draft resolution on the relationship between disarmament and development. Our delegation continues to believe that development and disarmament are two distinct issues that do not lend themselves to being linked. It was for that reason that the United States did not participate in the 1987 Conference on that matter. Accordingly, the United States does not, and will not, consider itself bound by the declaration in the Final Document of that Conference.

Draft resolutions like draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.29 have been under consideration by the First Committee for six years now. Member responses to the repeated requests for views during that period have not demonstrated any keen passion for seeking negotiated limits on the development and use of information technology. For the past two years, a Group of Governmental Experts has been meeting to explore further the merits of the subject. The United States supported the draft resolution on this issue throughout the previous General Assembly session, and participated in the Group of Governmental Experts in the hope that the focus might be redirected away from the futile and undesirable goal of circumscribing technology and towards the exploration of the promising contributions that many States could make with regard to the prevention of damage to national and global networked information systems and defensive networks, regardless of the origin of attack.

The stalemate within the Group of Governmental Experts regarding the attempt to itemize and limit existing and potential threats to information security underscored those differences. The United States had hoped this autumn to see a thoughtful redrafting of the draft resolution emphasizing areas of common ground. Instead, the new draft resolution acknowledges the Group of Governmental Experts, but not its failure, and seeks to cover the same ground. Moreover, the draft resolution seeks to advance the disputed case by calling for a global instrument and yet another group of governmental experts in the future.

While the United States welcomes one addition to the text — the clause calling for the identification of national efforts aimed at strengthening security and promoting international cooperation — it is insufficient to offset the remainder of the draft resolution. For those reasons, my delegation voted against the draft resolution.

Mr. Gala López (Cuba) (*spoke in Spanish*): My delegation would like to explain its position with respect to draft resolutions A/C.1/60/L.35 and L.39/Rev.1, as orally revised.

On draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.35, entitled "National legislation on transfer of arms, military equipment and dual-use goods and technology", which has just been adopted without a vote, my delegation reiterates that it falls within the framework of legally binding international treaties — treaties that have been negotiated multilaterally and that are universal in scope and non-discriminatory — capable of effectively guaranteeing strict international controls on the transfer of arms, military equipment and dual-use goods and technology.

The existence of export-control regimes based on selective and discriminatory criteria are in practice a serious obstacle to the implementation of the right of all States to use, for peaceful purposes, the various means and technologies that exist in the chemical, biological and nuclear areas. Cuba believes that the most effective model of export and import control would be one that was negotiated and applied in a true multilateral framework. Only broad and non-discriminatory participation in those controls can guarantee effectiveness in complying with the goals that have been set forth.

Multilateral efforts must be supplemented with measures adopted at the national level that strengthen commitments entered into by States in the context of the multilateral treaties on disarmament and non-proliferation to which they are parties.

Briefly, on draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.39/Rev.1, as orally revised, which has just been adopted, my delegation would like to emphasize the need to prevent

the risk of radiological terrorism. My country supports the relevant efforts that have been carried out within the context of the United Nations and other relevant international organizations. We reaffirm the central role played by the International Atomic Energy Agency in promoting and strengthening the technological and physical security of radioactive sources and materials. International efforts under way in this field should be fully in keeping with international law and the principles of the Charter.

The Chairman: We still have to deal with cluster 7, but we have little time and will soon have to adjourn the meeting.

I would like to draw attention to informal working paper number 5, which has just been distributed and which lists only four draft resolutions. Therefore, including the two backlog draft resolutions from today, six draft resolutions remain to be considered on Monday. So we will have to decide whether to have a meeting on Monday or to consider those six draft resolutions on Tuesday together with the other two. I believe that the majority of delegations would want to have a meeting on Monday. That appears to be the case.

In connection with agenda item 116, a draft of the proposed programme of work and timetable for the next session is being circulated to delegations for their consideration.

I should also like to inform the Committee that the presentation of the 2005 United Nations Disarmament Fellowship Programme certificates will take place in this conference room immediately after our meeting, and I urge members to remain in the room to witness the presentation.

Finally, I wish to remind all delegations that next week, which is the final week of Ramadan, the hours of the plenary meetings of the General Assembly and the meetings of the Main Committees will be from 9.30 a.m. to 12.30 p.m. and from 2.30 to 5.30 p.m.

I wish all members a restful weekend.

The meeting rose at 6.05 p.m.